

Publishers with whom we exchange, will oblige us by sending their papers in wrappers.

To Subscribers.—We earnestly request those of our friends who may have remitted their subscriptions to do so at once.

The sum is a small one; yet it is very important to our success. Our expenses, necessarily, are heavy; and as we meet them promptly, we hope subscribers will meet their obligations as promptly.

Rev. Dr. Craik—A Good Word.

This able clergyman, and most estimable citizen, moved, in the General Episcopal Convention, now in session in New York, to "enquire into the expediency of amending Canon 6 of 1844, relating to the admission of persons to the order of Deacons who have not received a collegiate education," and made an earnest speech on the subject.

The spirit of the speech was manly and Christian. Dr. Craik thought the rule unsuited to our age and country. It might suit the nobility of England, but not the masses. It would meet the wants of the upper ten thousand in New York city; but it could not supply those of the four hundred thousand. It could be made to reach the few everywhere; but it would not reach and convert the world. "Whence," he asked, "came the best and most zealous Christians? In the country at large—in the West certainly—from the masses, from the hard and warlike yeomen! Yet this rule looked to the wealthy only, who, said the Doctor, as a general rule, 'only became communicants because it was respectful to do so.'"

The resolution was referred to the committee on Canons. We hear, from private sources, that Dr. Craik's effort was a powerful one, and commended the most marked attention during its delivery. We hope he will succeed, and imbue the Church with his enlarged and philanthropic spirit.

Warren and Warren.

Our Carolina friends are waxing warm. One of them, through the Charleston Mercury, says, "let us act—let us have a Southern Convention." As to the means or manner of getting it up, he makes the following proposition:

Executive correspondence may arrange such preliminaries and particulars as may be necessary to be entered into for the carrying out of the election and assembly of such a body.

Let provisions be made for the people by the Executive of each State, simultaneously announcing the purpose of the Southern States to hold a Convention for purposes of Southern interests. Let writs of election be issued for the election of members to this Convention, and when this is done, and the people are called upon to do their duty, depend upon it, they will do it with a hearty welcome, and with a patriotic zeal, perhaps seldom if ever witnessed before within the limits of these Southern States.

If this policy be objectionable, let statesmen or politicians propose some course of policy for the South to pursue. If it is like this, it is not such a one as deserves consideration, let some other be proposed and adopted. And let something be adopted which embraces and points to united action in this important position of our Southern interests.

No man (I speak of Southern men) can refuse to admit the justice of the South's resistance; and every man should be prepared to enforce some course of resistance. Then why are the citizens of the South, her leading men, as well as her more private and retired politicians, so slow to suggest and adopt some course of policy and conduct adequate to the occasion and to her position as a people?

She has already suffered enough, both in reputation and interest, from her ruthless confederates.

Southern interests—what are they? Every State—Congress—the Supreme Court—all are the rights of masters are fully protected under the law. Not a move is made to wrest from Carolina, or any other Southern sovereignty, her exclusive sovereignty over the subject of slavery. What else is demanded? "Yes; yes!" replies this Carolina, "we know that; but the South has already suffered enough, both in reputation and interest, from her ruthless confederates."

How, when, where? "The tariff," responds our friend. "But you have one now which Mr. Calhoun voted for, and pronounced satisfactory." "Well, well," testifies the Carolina, the free States won't let us go with our slaves where we please. "They can't help that—the law determines this—besides, how can you admit the right of Congress to create slavery, since by that admission you confer necessarily the right to destroy it?" "No matter," rejoins the Nullifier, "we will have our way; give us that, and we will tear the Union to tatters."

In this spirit, the Carolina perpetualists will talk! "Disunion!" "ruthless confederates!" "Southern resistance," "the treacherous Democracy," "the recreant Whigs"—these, and like phrases, dance through their communications and speeches in thick profusion.

In North Carolina, except in a few districts, this spirit is condemned. In the other Southern States it is feared and disapproved. A Southern Statesman of eminence—one whom we shall not much fear to guess, and whose counsel and words would be deeply respected all over the South—writes a friend as follows on the subject of Slavery—Extension—and the course of South Carolina:

"If California or any other Mexican Department were ceded to us, the people (having already municipal laws) would thereby change allegiance; their relation to their ancient sovereign would be dissolved; but their relations to each other and their rights of Property would remain undisturbed; and, as their laws do not recognize slaves as property, but forbid the relation of Master and slave, how could it be introduced without a law of Congress creating it? Would not mere slave exclude it as effectively as any other mode? (vide Peters Reports, 21, &c.) If so, 'the South' would have to demand of Congress a law to introduce slavery into the new territory? If they do not, it becomes of our old doctrine of non-interference? If Congress has no power to establish it, how do we find a power to create it?"

Congress never yet created Slavery in any State or Territory. No State of the Union ever created Slavery. In all former acquisitions, the Territory was left to the original inhabitants; and all that has been done at any time was to obtain from abolishing those rights of purchase as they existed at the period of our purchase.

The Wilcox Provision principle, therefore, is not an old question. So far as it is identical with former contests in this respect, the argument is against Slavery Extension; for if Congress adheres to the old rule of taking Territory as we find it, the new purchase must be accepted as it is, with slavery forbidden by the existing law.

The Wilcox Provision is nothing more nor less than a friendly notice that this policy will be adhered to. So it strikes us. And if there occurs to me that Mr. Calhoun's abstract resolutions are exactly what will leave the newly acquired territory free of Slavery if they are fairly carried into practice.

Unless, forsooth, we act on the recommendation of a line and no peace, and consequently no Treaty, until immigration behind the Army pushes Slavery into the land under the sanction of Congress; whereby we shall find Slavery in the land when we acquire it by line and acquiescence, or by a Treaty at some future day.

"Hands off!" will suit him. He has sometimes believed that this was Mr. Calhoun's design, and it is the only supposition that reconciles his course with his reputation for sagacity.

What would the leading men of all sections in Washington have thought of taking Territory from a neighbor's territory, and planting Slavery in it? And what must the Christian Statesmen of our day feel in their hearts at this singular exhibition? Not a leading politician in all the South, however, has yet taken this position. Not a single Free in fourteen States dare to say, "We are unwilling to do this thing at all!" Yet I do know, and we all know, that there are thousands of Southern people who are as decidedly hostile to the creation of Slavery in regions which now know it not, as it is possible for men to be.

"I see the National Intelligencer has denunciation for drawing off the Northern Whigs from support of the 'Wilcox Provision.' But Mr. Calhoun (C. E. Fugate) has not stopped at defence. He has impudently proclaimed, 'You Northern men are not for us against us.' You Northern men may even go to Mr. Buchanan for the Missouri, Kansas, and what then? They will be required to do more, and confess that Slavery is neither a Moral nor a Political evil before their skirts will be clear of the imputation of Abolitionism. Judging by my own feelings, I should say the really independent and patriotic men of the South are sick of the strife. We have already all the Slave Territory on the continent, and it was a strong inducement for acquiescing in the Annexation of Texas that it was believed it would put an end to Negro Humbug and leave some of the States at liberty to think of the ways and means of getting rid of Negro Slavery themselves. This cannot be done so long as humbug is kept up and the issue is constantly changed at the dictation of agitators so as to keep up excitement—not hostility; for it is an entire mistake to suppose that the People of the South have any hostility to those of the North who are accepting Southern Carolina, which State seems to be mad."

Yours,  
Our Carolina friends must take care! It won't do for them to go so far as to drive the South from them!

Territory or no Territory.

The Mobile Herald (Whig) says:

"For the no territory principle, it may be said that it effectually evades the discussion of the Wilcox Provision, and all the evils which must follow in its train. This is a very great recommendation; but it involves another consideration. It would be a compromise on the part of the South. It would be equivalent to saying, 'we will reject an undoubted good for fear that receiving it may tempt our enemies to overstep the law, and thus disunite the country.' This is yielding a right to avoid giving a tyrannous majority an opportunity to do a great wrong."

The Cincinnati Gazette, in a clear and able article (which we publish on first page) shows that another view may be taken of this great question, and we wonder that it has not been presented before. We call the attention of Southern Statesmen to it, and especially that of our able friends. In order that it may not escape them, we present it in brief (a liberty which our friends of the Gazette will excuse, even though we weaken the force of their argument) and, in such form, as will enable all to understand clearly its view.

Under the proposition to acquire territory, these questions arise:

Shall this territory be free territory?

Shall it be slave territory?

Shall it be divided between slavery and freedom?

To answer these questions fairly, we must determine what the Law declares.

It is agreed, that slavery is the creature of positive law, and local in its character—so absolutely local that a person held as a slave, in one jurisdiction, cannot be held in another, where the institution is not organized.

It is agreed, also, that the Government of the United States has nothing to do with slavery as a National Institution—that it is wholly, and necessarily, a State Institution, which can only be sanctioned and upheld by State Law.

If slavery be local, if the Government of the United States can have, properly, nothing to do with it, it follows: that Congress has no power to institute slavery where it does not exist, and, therefore, none to establish it in Free Territory which may be acquired. What the States may do, when organized in such territory, is another question, which can be considered when it arises.

This, then, is the conclusion:

1st. That slavery cannot be introduced in any territory, now free, except by positive law.

2nd. That Congress has no power to enact such law.

Congress may enforce the provisions of the Constitution in favor of personal freedom; but it cannot introduce slavery against the Constitution. Mr. Justice McLean on circuit, and at Washington, has decided:

"If slaves are considered in some of the States as merchandise, that cannot divest them of the leading and controlling quality of persons by which they are designated in the Constitution. The character of property is given them by the local law. This law is respected, and all rights under it are protected by the Federal authorities; but the Constitution acts upon slaves as persons and not as property."

Again—

"The power over slavery belongs to the States respectively. It is local in its character, and its effects, and the transfer of slaves cannot be separated from this power."

Again—

"The Constitution acts upon a State, and not upon a Territory."

Do not these decisions—do not the principles contained in them—as regards human servitude—leave to legislation no other than a declaratory function, and establish as great fundamental doctrines, that slavery is local, and that the Government of the United States cannot introduce it into territory now free? If so, is not this the true and strong ground? Is it not the only safe ground for Statesmen to occupy? Is it a Constitutional platform on which all parties may rally—a platform on which they will find and have a sure and just foundation, and with it, a conciliating, but yet glorious national spirit.

The Mobile Herald must perceive, if this view be correct, that there will be no "evolution"—no compromise on the part of the South—"no tyrannous majority" at the North, doing, or seeking to do, a great wrong. The law of the land settles the question. Yet in doing so, it protects the States against any interference, while it forbids Congress from instituting slavery in territory now free. But we refer the Herald, and thinking men, to the article from the Cincinnati Gazette, and the authorities therein cited.

Branch.

Hon. Henry A. Wise has reached home. Before leaving the Court of Brazil, he enclosed documents from our Government, approving his conduct, when applying for his passport, and accompanied them with his remarks. The documents were returned unnoticed. He received, of course, his passport.

On the 28th of August, Mr. Tod, our Minister, presented his credentials, and made an appropriate address. To this the Emperor replied in English:

"I receive with pleasure the credentials which you present me in the name of my good friend, the President of the United States. They show that the same friendship and good understanding which exists between our government and that of your country, and which I believe you to be a true interpreter, who will remove the weighty difficulties in which your immediate predecessor involved himself."

The French ambassador was then presented, and after his audience was concluded, Mr. Tod presented the Secretary of the American Legation and several officers of the United States Navy.

Frigate Harrison.

This frigate, lying at anchor in Hampton Roads, caught fire last Monday week. The steamer *Jones* approached; but owing to the fact that the yellow fever was on board the frigate, only two passengers—Dr. R. P. Pritchard and Mr. Moxley, of North Carolina, with two slaves, could be induced to go on board of her. But these volunteers worked bravely, and being soon after aided by the men and engine of the U. S. ship *Pennsylvania*, the fire was extinguished.

The frigate, however, was really saved by the gallant North Carolinians, and the slaves whose companions them.

at all!" Yet I do know, and we all know, that there are thousands of Southern people who are as decidedly hostile to the creation of Slavery in regions which now know it not, as it is possible for men to be.

"I see the National Intelligencer has denunciation for drawing off the Northern Whigs from support of the 'Wilcox Provision.' But Mr. Calhoun (C. E. Fugate) has not stopped at defence. He has impudently proclaimed, 'You Northern men are not for us against us.' You Northern men may even go to Mr. Buchanan for the Missouri, Kansas, and what then? They will be required to do more, and confess that Slavery is neither a Moral nor a Political evil before their skirts will be clear of the imputation of Abolitionism. Judging by my own feelings, I should say the really independent and patriotic men of the South are sick of the strife. We have already all the Slave Territory on the continent, and it was a strong inducement for acquiescing in the Annexation of Texas that it was believed it would put an end to Negro Humbug and leave some of the States at liberty to think of the ways and means of getting rid of Negro Slavery themselves. This cannot be done so long as humbug is kept up and the issue is constantly changed at the dictation of agitators so as to keep up excitement—not hostility; for it is an entire mistake to suppose that the People of the South have any hostility to those of the North who are accepting Southern Carolina, which State seems to be mad."

Yours,

Our Carolina friends must take care! It won't do for them to go so far as to drive the South from them!

Territory or no Territory.

The Mobile Herald (Whig) says:

"For the no territory principle, it may be said that it effectually evades the discussion of the Wilcox Provision, and all the evils which must follow in its train. This is a very great recommendation; but it involves another consideration. It would be a compromise on the part of the South. It would be equivalent to saying, 'we will reject an undoubted good for fear that receiving it may tempt our enemies to overstep the law, and thus disunite the country.' This is yielding a right to avoid giving a tyrannous majority an opportunity to do a great wrong."

The Cincinnati Gazette, in a clear and able article (which we publish on first page) shows that another view may be taken of this great question, and we wonder that it has not been presented before. We call the attention of Southern Statesmen to it, and especially that of our able friends. In order that it may not escape them, we present it in brief (a liberty which our friends of the Gazette will excuse, even though we weaken the force of their argument) and, in such form, as will enable all to understand clearly its view.

Under the proposition to acquire territory, these questions arise:

Shall this territory be free territory?

Shall it be slave territory?

Shall it be divided between slavery and freedom?

To answer these questions fairly, we must determine what the Law declares.

It is agreed, that slavery is the creature of positive law, and local in its character—so absolutely local that a person held as a slave, in one jurisdiction, cannot be held in another, where the institution is not organized.

It is agreed, also, that the Government of the United States has nothing to do with slavery as a National Institution—that it is wholly, and necessarily, a State Institution, which can only be sanctioned and upheld by State Law.

If slavery be local, if the Government of the United States can have, properly, nothing to do with it, it follows: that Congress has no power to institute slavery where it does not exist, and, therefore, none to establish it in Free Territory which may be acquired. What the States may do, when organized in such territory, is another question, which can be considered when it arises.

This, then, is the conclusion:

1st. That slavery cannot be introduced in any territory, now free, except by positive law.

2nd. That Congress has no power to enact such law.

Congress may enforce the provisions of the Constitution in favor of personal freedom; but it cannot introduce slavery against the Constitution. Mr. Justice McLean on circuit, and at Washington, has decided:

"If slaves are considered in some of the States as merchandise, that cannot divest them of the leading and controlling quality of persons by which they are designated in the Constitution. The character of property is given them by the local law. This law is respected, and all rights under it are protected by the Federal authorities; but the Constitution acts upon slaves as persons and not as property."

Again—

"The power over slavery belongs to the States respectively. It is local in its character, and its effects, and the transfer of slaves cannot be separated from this power."

Again—

"The Constitution acts upon a State, and not upon a Territory."

Do not these decisions—do not the principles contained in them—as regards human servitude—leave to legislation no other than a declaratory function, and establish as great fundamental doctrines, that slavery is local, and that the Government of the United States cannot introduce it into territory now free? If so, is not this the true and strong ground? Is it not the only safe ground for Statesmen to occupy? Is it a Constitutional platform on which all parties may rally—a platform on which they will find and have a sure and just foundation, and with it, a conciliating, but yet glorious national spirit.

The Mobile Herald must perceive, if this view be correct, that there will be no "evolution"—no compromise on the part of the South—"no tyrannous majority" at the North, doing, or seeking to do, a great wrong. The law of the land settles the question. Yet in doing so, it protects the States against any interference, while it forbids Congress from instituting slavery in territory now free. But we refer the Herald, and thinking men, to the article from the Cincinnati Gazette, and the authorities therein cited.

Branch.

Hon. Henry A. Wise has reached home. Before leaving the Court of Brazil, he enclosed documents from our Government, approving his conduct, when applying for his passport, and accompanied them with his remarks. The documents were returned unnoticed. He received, of course, his passport.

On the 28th of August, Mr. Tod, our Minister, presented his credentials, and made an appropriate address. To this the Emperor replied in English:

"I receive with pleasure the credentials which you present me in the name of my good friend, the President of the United States. They show that the same friendship and good understanding which exists between our government and that of your country, and which I believe you to be a true interpreter, who will remove the weighty difficulties in which your immediate predecessor involved himself."

The French ambassador was then presented, and after his audience was concluded, Mr. Tod presented the Secretary of the American Legation and several officers of the United States Navy.

Frigate Harrison.

This frigate, lying at anchor in Hampton Roads, caught fire last Monday week. The steamer *Jones* approached; but owing to the fact that the yellow fever was on board the frigate, only two passengers—Dr. R. P. Pritchard and Mr. Moxley, of North Carolina, with two slaves, could be induced to go on board of her. But these volunteers worked bravely, and being soon after aided by the men and engine of the U. S. ship *Pennsylvania*, the fire was extinguished.

The frigate, however, was really saved by the gallant North Carolinians, and the slaves whose companions them.

at all!" Yet I do know, and we all know, that there are thousands of Southern people who are as decidedly hostile to the creation of Slavery in regions which now know it not, as it is possible for men to be.

"I see the National Intelligencer has denunciation for drawing off the Northern Whigs from support of the 'Wilcox Provision.' But Mr. Calhoun (C. E. Fugate) has not stopped at defence. He has impudently proclaimed, 'You Northern men are not for us against us.' You Northern men may even go to Mr. Buchanan for the Missouri, Kansas, and what then? They will be required to do more, and confess that Slavery is neither a Moral nor a Political evil before their skirts will be clear of the imputation of Abolitionism. Judging by my own feelings, I should say the really independent and patriotic men of the South are sick of the strife. We have already all the Slave Territory on the continent, and it was a strong inducement for acquiescing in the Annexation of Texas that it was believed it would put an end to Negro Humbug and leave some of the States at liberty to think of the ways and means of getting rid of Negro Slavery themselves. This cannot be done so long as humbug is kept up and the issue is constantly changed at the dictation of agitators so as to keep up excitement—not hostility; for it is an entire mistake to suppose that the People of the South have any hostility to those of the North who are accepting Southern Carolina, which State seems to be mad."

Yours,

Our Carolina friends must take care! It won't do for them to go so far as to drive the South from them!

Territory or no Territory.

The Mobile Herald (Whig) says:

"For the no territory principle, it may be said that it effectually evades the discussion of the Wilcox Provision, and all the evils which must follow in its train. This is a very great recommendation; but it involves another consideration. It would be a compromise on the part of the South. It would be equivalent to saying, 'we will reject an undoubted good for fear that receiving it may tempt our enemies to overstep the law, and thus disunite the country.' This is yielding a right to avoid giving a tyrannous majority an opportunity to do a great wrong."

The Cincinnati Gazette, in a clear and able article (which we publish on first page) shows that another view may be taken of this great question, and we wonder that it has not been presented before. We call the attention of Southern Statesmen to it, and especially that of our able friends. In order that it may not escape them, we present it in brief (a liberty which our friends of the Gazette will excuse, even though we weaken the force of their argument) and, in such form, as will enable all to understand clearly its view.

Under the proposition to acquire territory, these questions arise:

Shall this territory be free territory?

Shall it be slave territory?

Shall it be divided between slavery and freedom?

To answer these questions fairly, we must determine what the Law declares.

It is agreed, that slavery is the creature of positive law, and local in its character—so absolutely local that a person held as a slave, in one jurisdiction, cannot be held in another, where the institution is not organized.

It is agreed, also, that the Government of the United States has nothing to do with slavery as a National Institution—that it is wholly, and necessarily, a State Institution, which can only be sanctioned and upheld by State Law.

If slavery be local, if the Government of the United States can have, properly, nothing to do with it, it follows: that Congress has no power to institute slavery where it does not exist, and, therefore, none to establish it in Free Territory which may be acquired. What the States may do, when organized in such territory, is another question, which can be considered when it arises.

This, then, is the conclusion:

1st. That slavery cannot be introduced in any territory, now free, except by positive law.

2nd. That Congress has no power to enact such law.

Congress may enforce the provisions of the Constitution in favor of personal freedom; but it cannot introduce slavery against the Constitution. Mr. Justice McLean on circuit, and at Washington, has decided:

"If slaves are considered in some of the States as merchandise, that cannot divest them of the leading and controlling quality of persons by which they are designated in the Constitution. The character of property is given them by the local law. This law is respected, and all rights under it are protected by the Federal authorities; but the Constitution acts upon slaves as persons and not as property."

Again—

"The power over slavery belongs to the States respectively. It is local in its character, and its effects, and the transfer of slaves cannot be separated from this power."

Again—

"The Constitution acts upon a State, and not upon a Territory."

Do not these decisions—do not the principles contained in them—as regards human servitude—leave to legislation no other than a declaratory function, and establish as great fundamental doctrines, that slavery is local, and that the Government of the United States cannot introduce it into territory now free? If so, is not this the true and strong ground? Is it not the only safe ground for Statesmen to occupy? Is it a Constitutional platform on which all parties may rally—a platform on which they will find and have a sure and just foundation, and with it, a conciliating, but yet glorious national spirit.

The Mobile Herald must perceive, if this view be correct, that there will be no "evolution"—no compromise on the part of the South—"no tyrannous majority" at the North, doing, or seeking to do, a great wrong. The law of the land settles the question. Yet in doing so, it protects the States against any interference, while it forbids Congress from instituting slavery in territory now free. But we refer the Herald, and thinking men, to the article from the Cincinnati Gazette, and the authorities therein cited.

Branch.

Hon. Henry A. Wise has reached home. Before leaving the Court of Brazil, he enclosed documents from our Government, approving his conduct, when applying for his passport, and accompanied them with his remarks. The documents were returned unnoticed. He received, of course, his passport.

On the 28th of August, Mr. Tod, our Minister, presented his credentials, and made an appropriate address. To this the Emperor replied in English:

"I receive with pleasure the credentials which you present me in the name of my good friend, the President of the United States. They show that the same friendship and good understanding which exists between our government and that of your country, and which I believe you to be a true interpreter, who will remove the weighty difficulties in which your immediate predecessor involved himself."

The French ambassador was then presented, and after his audience was concluded, Mr. Tod presented the Secretary of the American Legation and several officers of the United States Navy.

Frigate Harrison.

This frigate, lying at anchor in Hampton Roads, caught fire last Monday week. The steamer *Jones* approached; but owing to the fact that the yellow fever was on board the frigate, only two passengers—Dr. R. P. Pritchard and Mr. Moxley, of North Carolina, with two slaves, could be induced to go on board of her. But these volunteers worked bravely, and being soon after aided by the men and engine of the U. S. ship *Pennsylvania*, the fire was extinguished.

The frigate, however, was really saved by the gallant North Carolinians, and the slaves whose companions them.

at all!" Yet I do know, and we all know, that there are thousands of Southern people who are as decidedly hostile to the creation of Slavery in regions which now know it not, as it is possible for men to be.

"I see the National Intelligencer has denunciation for drawing off the Northern Whigs from support of the 'Wilcox Provision.' But Mr. Calhoun (C. E. Fugate) has not stopped at defence. He has impudently proclaimed, 'You Northern men are not for us against us.' You Northern men may even go to Mr. Buchanan for the Missouri, Kansas, and what then? They will be required to do more, and confess that Slavery is neither a Moral nor a Political evil before their skirts will be clear of the imputation of Abolitionism. Judging by my own feelings, I should say the really independent and patriotic men of the South are sick of the strife. We have already all the Slave Territory on the continent, and it was a strong inducement for acquiescing in the Annexation of Texas that it was believed it would put an end to Negro Humbug and leave some of the States at liberty to think of the ways and means of getting rid of Negro Slavery themselves. This cannot be done so long as humbug is kept up and the issue is constantly changed at the dictation of agitators so as to keep up excitement—not hostility; for it is an entire mistake to suppose that the People of the South have any hostility to those of the North who are accepting Southern Carolina, which State seems to be mad."

Yours,

Our Carolina friends must take care! It won't do for them to go so far as to drive the South from them!

Territory or no Territory.

The Mobile Herald (Whig) says:

"For the no territory principle, it may be said that it effectually evades the discussion of the Wilcox Provision, and all the evils which must follow in its train. This is a very great recommendation; but it involves another consideration. It would be a compromise on the part of the South. It would be equivalent to saying, 'we will reject an undoubted good for fear that receiving it may tempt our enemies to overstep the law, and thus disunite the country.' This is yielding a right to avoid giving a tyrannous majority an opportunity to do a great wrong."

The Cincinnati Gazette, in a clear and able article (which we publish on first page) shows that another view may be taken of this great question, and we wonder that it has not been presented before. We call the attention of Southern Statesmen to it, and especially that of our able friends. In order that it may not escape them, we present it in brief (a liberty which our friends of the Gazette will excuse, even though we weaken the force of their argument) and, in such form, as will enable all to understand clearly its view.

Under the proposition to acquire territory, these questions arise:

Shall this territory be free territory?

Shall it be slave territory?

Shall it be divided between slavery and freedom?

To answer these questions fairly, we must determine what the Law declares.

It is agreed, that slavery is the creature of positive law, and local in its character—so absolutely local that a person held as a slave, in one jurisdiction, cannot be held in another, where the institution is not organized.

It is agreed, also, that the Government of the United States has nothing to do with slavery as a National Institution—that it is wholly, and necessarily, a State Institution, which can only be sanctioned and upheld by State Law.

If slavery be local, if the Government of the United States can have, properly, nothing to do with it, it follows: that Congress has no power to institute slavery where it does not exist, and, therefore, none to establish it in Free Territory which may be acquired. What the States may do, when organized in such territory, is another question, which can be considered when it arises.

This, then, is the conclusion:

1st. That slavery cannot be introduced in any territory, now free, except by positive law.

2nd. That Congress has no power to enact such law.

Congress may enforce the provisions of the Constitution in favor of personal freedom; but it cannot introduce slavery against the Constitution. Mr. Justice McLean on circuit, and at Washington, has decided:

"If slaves are considered in some of the States as merchandise, that cannot divest them of the leading and controlling quality of persons by which they are designated in the Constitution. The character of property is given them by the local law. This law is respected, and all rights under it are protected by the Federal authorities; but the Constitution acts upon slaves as persons and not as property."

Again—